UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/977,143	10/12/2001	Robert M. Hanevold	BELL-0156/01275	2338

38952	7590	08/12/2004	

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP
ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER
BURGE, LONDRA C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _10 October 2001_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-14_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-14_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _2/20/2003_.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: Original Application filed

10/10/2001 and IDS filed 2/20/2003

2. Claims 1-14 are pending. Claims 1, 5 and 10 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   **The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102**

that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4.   **Claims 1-2 and 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated**

by Brandt et al. (herein after Brandt) U.S. Patent No. 6,125,384 filed12/23/1996.

In regard to independent claim 1, Brandt discloses *rendering source code that*

defines said data input screen in said client device (Brandt Col 7 Lines 49-67 and Col 8

Lines 1-9); *defining an executable script within said source code* (Brandt Col 5 Lines 27-

37); *and executing said executable script in response to user input, wherein said*

executable script operates within said client device to render said data input screen

inaccessible to prevent subsequent user input. (Brandt Col 7 Lines 60-67 and Col Lines

1-10)

In regard to dependent claim 2, Brandt discloses *wherein said source code*

comprises a tag-based language. (Brandt Col 8 Lines 29-50 i.e. HTML)

In regard to dependent claim 4, Brandt discloses *wherein said data input screen is received from a remote server and said step of executing said executable script is performed solely on said client device without any further processing by said remote server.* (Brandt Col 29 Lines 10-40 i.e. client workstation and web server)

In regard to dependent claim 5, Brandt discloses *a central processing unit; a memory* (Brandt Col 27 Lines 10-12 i.e. CPU and memory); *a user input device; a display; and a browser adapted to render said input screen on said display, wherein source code is provided to said browser that contains instructions that are interpreted by said browser to render said input screen inaccessible after an executable script contained within said source code is executed on said client device.* (Brandt Col 13 Lines 42-67 and Col 14 Lines 1-10 i.e. input data and workstation monitor and a web browser receiving information and programs)

In regard to dependent claim 6, Brandt discloses *wherein said executable code is executed in response to user input.* (Brandt Col 7 Lines 60-67 and Col Lines 1-10)

In regard to dependent claim 7, Claim 7 reflects the same subject matter claimed in claim 2 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   **The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:**

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   **Claims 3, 8-12 and 13-14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandt et al. as applied to claims 1 and 5, in view of Brown et al. (herein after Brown) U.S. Patent No. 6,278,448 B1 filed 2/17/1998.**

In regard to dependent claim 3, Brandt does not disclose *wherein said source code defines a membrane layer at a higher z-index level than other Web page elements, and said step of executing said executable script further comprises changing a visibility attribute of said membrane layer.* However, Brown mentions a z-index that is defined and also layers (Brown Col 11 Lines 43-67 and Col 12 Lines 1-43 and Col 7 Lines 49-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply Brown to Brandt providing Brandt the benefit of defining a z-index and layers that would be important in changing the attributes and characteristics on the layers as taught by Brown Col 7 Lines 49-65.

In regard to dependent claim 8, Brandt does not disclose *wherein said source code defines a membrane, and wherein a visibility attribute of said membrane is changed by said executable script.* However, Brown mentions layers known as wallpaper that can be visible and manipulated and resized (Brown Col 7 Lines 49-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply Brown to Brandt providing Brandt the benefit of defining a layer, which can be modified, and be beneficial to the process the attributes as taught by Brown Col 49-67 and Col 8 Lines 1-10.

In regard to dependent claim 9, Brandt does not disclose *wherein said membrane is defined as a layer in a cascading style sheet web page.* However, Brown shows code that includes cascading style sheets (Brown Col 11 Lines 47-67 and Col 12

Lines 1-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply Brown to Brandt providing Brandt the benefit of having style sheets which will define certain characteristics of a website.

In regard to independent claim 10, Brandt discloses *a form definition component defining a data input screen and a data submission field* (Brandt Col 11 Lines 13-27)

Brandt does not disclose *a style definition component defining a layer having a width and height at least as large as said data submission field; a function definition component responsive to said data submission field, wherein upon execution of said function definition component, said layer operates to render said data submission field inaccessible on said form.* However, Brown shows code that includes cascading style sheets, which define widths and columns to submit forms submitted (Brown Col 11 Lines 47-67 and Col 12 Lines 1-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply Brown to Brandt providing Brandt the benefit of having style sheets which will define certain characteristics of a website such as the width and height of the fields.

In regard to dependent claim 11, Brandt discloses wherein *said layer is initially defined as hidden, and is made visible upon execution of said function definition.* (Brandt Col 8 Lines 45-50)

In regard to dependent claim 12, Brandt does not disclose *wherein said layer comprises one of plural layers in a cascading style sheet web page.* However, Brown mentions layers known as wallpaper that can be visible and manipulated and resized (Brown Col 7 Lines 49-65) (Brown Col 11 Lines 47-67 and Col 12 Lines 1-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply Brown to Brandt providing

Brandt the benefit of defining a layer, which can be modified, and be beneficial to the process the attributes as taught by Brown Col 49-67 and Col 8 Lines 1-10 and the benefit of having style sheets which will define certain characteristics of a website.

In regard to dependent claim 13, Brandt discloses *wherein said function definition component is executed in response to user operation of said data submission field.* (Brandt Col 3 Lines 25-42)

In regard to dependent claim 14, Brandt discloses *wherein said function definition component is executed solely within a client device to prevent subsequent data entry via said data input screen.* (Brandt Col 29 Lines 10-40)

Conclusion

7.   **The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.**

Lagarde et al.	U.S. Patent No. 5,761,663	issued	6/2/1998
Dykes et al.	U.S. Patent No. 5,872,915	issued	2/16/1999
Bertram et al.	U.S. Patent No. 6,049,812	issued	4/11/2000
Brandt et al.	U.S. Patent No. 6,144,990	issued	11/7/2000

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Londra C Burge whose telephone number is 703-305-8784. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 703-308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, DC 20231

Or faxed to:
(703) 746-7239 (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:
(703) 746-7240 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Or:
(703) 746-7238 (for after-final communications)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal

Drive, Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

Londra Burge
8/2/04

STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER